	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary		
	09/675,386 Examiner	SHIBAMOTO, GORO Art Unit
	Mark Ruthkosky	1745
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PT		
(1) Mark Ruthkosky.	(3)	
(2) Janet for Mr. Metzger.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 February 2004.		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)□ No.	
Claim(s) discussed:		
Identification of prior art discussed:		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) № N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>The applicant inquired as to the status of the prosecution as the office action summary stated that the rejection was final however, the body of the action did not address the final rejection. The examiner confirmed that the rejection was final.</u>		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required